



Planning Commission

Regular Meeting Agenda

SCAN FOR AGENDA
PACKET



Frances Meaders Council Chambers
151 Willowbend Road
February 9, 2026 | 6:30 PM

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Announcements**
4. **Presentations**
5. **Agenda Changes**
6. **Minutes**
 1. Planning Commission Meeting January 26, 2026
7. **Old Agenda Items**
8. **New Agenda Items**
9. **Public Hearings**
 1. Consider a Text Amendment to the Lighting Ordinance, specifically Sec. 731.2 of the Land Development Ordinance
 2. Consider a Text Amendment to the Parking Ordinance, specifically Sec. 909 - Off-Street Automobile Parking Requirements
10. **Member/Staff Topics**
11. **Adjourn**

It is the policy of the City of Peachtree City that all city-sponsored public meetings and events are accessible to people with disabilities and are in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. If you need assistance in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability as defined under the ADA or need assistance per Title VI, please contact the City's Title VI and ADA Coordinator, Dr. Teaa Allston-Bing at (770) 632-4276 or e-mail tallston-bing@peachtree-city.org at least three (3) business days before the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation.

Planning Commission of Peachtree City
Meeting Minutes
Monday, January 26, 2026
6:30 PM

Call to Order

The Peachtree City Planning Commission met at City Hall on Monday, January 26, 2026. Chairman Scott Ritenour called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Vice-Chairman Andrew Kriz, Commissioners Hans Gant, Jack Allen, Robert Halverson, and Alternate Kenneth Hamner were present. Also in attendance were Planning and Development Director Shayla Reed, Senior Planner Lora Hooks, Recording Secretary Martha Barksdale, and IT Specialists Ken Couch and Ryan Williams. In addition, the City Manager, Justin Strickland and Councilwoman Suzanne Brown attended the meeting.

Pledge of Allegiance

Ritenour opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Announcements

Ritenour acknowledged members of the Fire and Rescue Department and the Engineering Department who were in attendance, along with Strickland and Brown. He recognized the citizens who had turned out to learn more about a development planned near their neighborhoods.

Reed explained that there would be no opportunity for public comment during the workshop portion of the meeting, only during the public hearing. Ritenour noted they had received many emails from citizens, and those had been read by the Planning Commission.

Presentations

None

Agenda Changes

None

Minutes

Gant moved to approve the January 12, 2026, Planning Commission meeting minutes. Allen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

1. Planning Commission Meeting January 12, 2026

Gant moved to approve the January 12, 2026, Planning Commission meeting minutes. Allen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

None

New Agenda Items

1. Discussion to consider a text amendment to the Parking Ordinance, Sec. 909, Off-Street Automobile Parking Requirements

Section 909 of the Zoning Ordinance established requirements for off-street automobile parking, and Section 706 required connections to the shared-use paths

from all residential and commercial developments. The Planning Commission had discussed that, since path connections were required, the parking regulations should be revised to facilitate parking for those golf carts.

At the previous meeting, they had suggested allowing developers to substitute golf cart spaces for regular parking spaces up to a certain limit. Staff recommended the ordinance define a particular location. A City Council member had mentioned that bicycle parking be mentioned in the ordinance, and Reed said designating a preferred location would be helpful.

Reed said they also would be looking at revising the calculation for the minimum off-street parking requirements. She mentioned the increase in telehealth services, which cut down on in-person doctor visits, resulting in a need for fewer parking spaces at medical facilities. Currently, one parking space was required for every 250 square feet of gross floor area, but Reed said they might want to consider changing that to one space for every 300 feet of gross floor area. Finally, she added, the City Manager had recommended they look at the entire parking code to ensure that it was in compliance with current standards.

The City Council had initiated this on January 5, and the Planning Commission could discuss it at this meeting and make their recommendations to Council on February 9. Council would vote on it at their March 19 meeting.

Allen commented that automobile parking and cart parking took up a great deal of space, but bicycle parking did not and seemed like a totally different topic. Kriz responded that they had seen many requests for bike parking, but it was debatable if it belonged in this off-street parking ordinance. Reed remarked that each site was different, and she and the City Engineer could discuss what might be best and bring that back to the Commission.

Halverson asked if they were talking about relabeling auto spaces for carts, remarking that golf carts were getting bigger and did not fit in some spaces currently designated for carts. Reed said the length would be the issue and something they would have to consider. Another consideration, Ritenour mentioned, was Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance.

There should be signs at the golf cart parking that made it clear no cars were allowed, Halverson added.

Ritenour recalled that not too long ago there had been requests from businesses to expand the parking allowance at medical facilities. He saw the need for flexibility but was concerned that if they gave up those spots, and they were needed in the future, it would not be easy to restore them.

Reed agreed there were some uses that needed the maximum number of allowed spaces, and that was something they could consider when doing an overall review

of the parking ordinance. She added that they hadn't looked at all the possibilities for accommodating cart parking, and staff would explore those and present them to the Planning Commission. Reed agreed that it could be a trend, and they didn't want to introduce any changes that would be difficult to reverse.

Kriz said he liked the idea of suggesting, but not mandating, the location of golf cart parking. He agreed that bicycle parking and the reduction of spaces for certain businesses should be separate and remarked that he wished they had data on how parking was utilized at different businesses.

Ritenour asked Kriz and Hamner if they recalled how bike parking was handled in the revamped 54 West Overlay district? They agreed it was placed in separate areas, not part of the parking lot. Ritenour said he thought the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) could give some guidance on where it should be located. Kriz added that he would like to see bike parking be mandatory for commercial properties.

Signage for designated golf cart parking was a good idea, he continued, but would they then need to include an enforcement component? Reed replied that she had explored various options with the Senior Code Enforcement Officer, and that could be part of the proposal.

Ritenour said this seemed to be a very good starting point, and he was looking forward to seeing the final version.

2. Discussion to consider a text amendment to the Lighting Ordinance, Sec. 731.2 of the Land Development Ordinance

The current language in the parking ordinance regarding lighting listed several types of lighting as the only ones allowed. The proposed change would add light-emitting diode (LED) as an option. Reed said she planned to bring this back to the Planning Commission for their recommendation on February 9 and to Council on March 19.

Gant asked what type of properties this would apply to, and Reed responded that it would be commercial and industrial.

Halverson stated that the last sentence in 731.2, "The same type of lighting must be utilized for all fixtures and light sources on the site" could be misleading. He thought they were trying to say that for similar applications all lighting should be similar. Differing uses called for different types of lighting, he remarked.

Hamner mentioned that some older LED lights had a "blue light glare" that could be prevented by having rules about the temperature of the lights. Did this ordinance need something like that?

Halverson explained that they probably didn't want to mandate just one color temperature because it depended on the use. A restaurant would want a different type of light than a commercial site. Hamner said that was what he was talking about.

That was a good point, Ritenour remarked, adding that he would like to see them state that LED was the preferred type of lighting. His reasons included power usage and longevity, saying LEDs were the more environmentally friendly choice. He said most commercial properties seemed to be going to LED. He didn't want them to require LED but say that it was preferred.

Allen said he could agree as long as it was preferred but not required.

How to handle temperatures? Ritenour wondered, Kriz suggested they say that similar applications should have similar temperature gradings.

Hamner asked if they should be concerned with this because it was his understanding that the blue light glare was associated with older LEDs. Halverson agreed, saying technology had improved in the past few years.

Hooks mentioned that there was a chart in the ordinance that talked about maximum illumination levels. Halverson said that wasn't an issue; they were just talking about color and technology.

They definitely had some things to be reviewed and incorporated, Ritenour remarked, adding that he looked forward to seeing the final proposal.

Public Hearings

1. Consider a text amendment to Section 917 of the city's Code of Ordinances related to Short-Term Rentals

World Cup matches were set to be played in Atlanta June 1-July 31, bringing an influx of visitors. This amendment would allow anyone to provide their property as a short-term rental (STR) during that timeframe without having to receive a permit from the City or pay fees to the City. This would allow interested citizens to take advantage of the "Augusta Rule," which meant the income earned from renting a home for 14 days or less is not subject to income tax. Council initiated this amendment on August 21 and planned to hear it at their February 12 meeting.

Ritenour opened the public hearing for comments. No one wished to speak either in favor or in opposition, and he closed the hearing.

Gant asked if there would be a limit on how many people could stay in one of these rentals or how many cars could park on the streets. Reed said there wouldn't be any changes to the current code, which did not specify numbers of occupants.

Kriz asked if this erased the guidelines on STRs during that period, and Reed said it did not, except for the permitting requirement during those dates. Hamner also verified that the other parts, such as requiring a local contact, would still apply, and Reed said it would. Kriz mentioned the requirement that neighbors be notified. Did that apply?

The City Manager then reviewed the language in the proposed text amendment. He said none of the STR ordinance would be in effect during those two months. Fayette Forward, a new branch of the Fayette County Development Authority, had created a website where people could register their homes for rent during the World Cup.

Halverson asked if a homeowners association's rules preventing rentals could supersede this suspension of the ordinance, and Strickland said it could. Halverson said he wanted the public to understand that.

Allen wanted to know how long the normal permitting process took, and Reed said it usually took less than five days to process. If it was so quick, Allen countered, why lift the restrictions. Strickland said it was because the ordinance limited the total number of homes that could be STRs, but Kriz said it was his understanding that there were very few STRs. The County approached Peachtree City about lifting the ordinance to make it easier for homeowners who wanted to rent and also to entice people to visit the county and spend money.

Ritenour said he had no issue with the premise of opening it up for more STRs, but his concern was with suspending everything in 917. He wondered if they could keep the ordinance as it was written except for removing the limitation on the number of STRs. He wanted the City to maintain oversight by having the STRs registered. Strickland said it was up to the Planning Commission to make a recommendation and Council to decide, but anything was possible. He said his recommendation would be to make it easy on the homeowners.

Kriz was concerned that this opened the doors to the same type of problems that spurred the creation of the STR ordinance. Allen said asking for registration would give homeowners notice that they could operate only during this two-month period. Ritenour said he believed most people would do it only during the World Cup period.

Halverson said the intentions seemed good, but he was concerned how it could be undone. Maybe some people would keep going with their rental after the two months without a permit. Strickland said they could do that now, although the City did employ monitoring software. The whole point was that it could be only for 14 days, he stated, and Fayette Forward and Peachtree City's communications Department would publicize that fact. They could require registration on the Fayette Forward website, he suggested, with the requirement that they give a copy to the City.

Allen asked if he could rent his house for four two-week periods. Strickland said only one two-week period would be exempt from income taxes, but Kriz remarked there was nothing to stop someone from renting their home for the whole two months—they would just have to report the income. They would be renting without any regulation or restriction.

Kriz said he liked the idea of people coming to Fayette during the World Cup but felt throwing all their rules aside was not the way to do it.

Hamner noted that the people who rented through Airbnb or other platforms had to follow their rules, but these World Cup STRs did not have to follow any rules. Council and the Planning Commission spent a lot of time formulating this ordinance, and he was concerned with things like not requiring a local contact.

Ritenour said they had some options. They could draft an ordinance and send it back to City Council or they could recommend approval or denial as submitted. Kriz asked if staff was receptive to taking their comments and creating a new proposal with some guidelines. He mentioned just removing the limitation on the number of STRs and letting everything else stand.

They were on a tight timeline, Strickland remarked, and he asked that they make a motion, whether negative or positive, and add their comments.

Gant suggested they stipulate that the STRs be registered. Kriz asked who it should be registered with. Reed remarked that this had already been advertised for Council, so they needed a recommendation now.

Allen said he would be satisfied with registration with the City and listing a local point of contact. Ritenour said that's what they needed at a minimum. They all wanted to welcome visitors to Peachtree City, but they shouldn't ignore this ordinance that they spent so much time on. Kriz agreed that it would be foolish to suspend it for two months and possibly open things up to abuse. Hamner agreed with Kriz.

Ritenour wanted to go through the ordinance and see what they should maintain. Allen said ideally there should be more restrictions, but it seemed they should either recommend denial or recommend approval with some conditions. Kriz noted that they could move to recommend denial but say that if it were approved, there should be certain conditions. Ritenour agreed.

Kriz moved to recommend denial for the text amendment to section 917 of the City's Code of Ordinances related to short-term rentals with comments that the Planning Commission recommended some sort of registration, guidelines provided to the homeowner, and a local point of contact. Short of going through the entire ordinance, Kriz said this expressed their thoughts but allowed Council to figure out

the method. Allen seconded.

Ritenour recapped the motion, saying it was to recommend denial with comments that if Council did approve this, registration and a local point of contact should be required. Kriz added that guidelines regarding City STR standards should be provided to the homeowners. Motion carried unanimously.

Workshop Items

1. Concept Plat, Bradshaw Estates, 201 Sumner Road

Ritenour reminded the citizens in attendance that comments from the public were not allowed in a workshop but staff had passed on their emails to the Planning Commission.

Hooks said she would give a brief explanation of the proposal and how it did or did not meet the zoning requirements, then turn it over to the applicant for questions and comments from the Planning Commission.

She showed the location of the property and said it was zoned as Residential (R-43) with a minimum lot size of one acre and a minimum floor area of 1,500 square feet for the dwellings. Front setbacks were 50 feet, side setbacks 15 feet, and rear setbacks 30.

The entire parcel was not proposed to be developed at this time, and Hooks showed the dividing line and pointed out the city limits. The proposal included two sections, divided by a creek, with the northern section having 30 lots accessed via Sims Road in Kedron Hills and the southern, 29 lots accessed from Sumner Road. The two sections would be connected only by a cart path over the creek.

The Land Development Ordinance (LDO) required that a conceptual plat include approximate location of property lines, approximate location of existing and proposed easements, approximate topography, approximate location and width of streets, approximate location and size of the lots, approximate location and size of parcels of land to be set aside for recreation or other public use, and proposed locations of multi-use paths, greenbelts and other areas to be landscaped. Hooks noted that all of these were approximate, and the details would be pinned down during the next phase of the platting process.

The site plan showed that homes with a footprint of 2,000 square feet would fit on the lots, which met the requirement. The developer was required to provide open space at three acres per 100 dwelling units, which meant the proposed 59 residential lots would require at least 1.77 acres of open space, and the developer intended to exceed that by providing 2.22 acres. The LDO required screening only between commercial and residential developments, so buffers were not required between this and the surrounding developments. There would be a greenbelt between some adjacent lots to the west and the street to prevent them from having

multiple frontages. Sumner Road was considered a major thoroughfare with a requirement of a continuous 25-foot-wide city-owned greenbelt buffer adjacent to the road, and this condition was met.

The Police and Fire Departments had expressed concern about the lack of connection between the two phases. Hooks read a statement from the Police Department that said they were already dealing with extended response times to the rear portion of Kedron Hills along Astoria Lane, and this development would further increase response times and expand the number of residents and locations potentially impacted by those delays. The Police recommended inclusion of a connecting roadway between the northern and southern parcels, with access to both Astoria Lane and Sumner Road. The Fire Department expressed similar concerns.

Ritenour outlined the concept plat approval process. Section 402 of the LDO said the City Planner would present the results of staff's review, including conditions as appropriate, to the Planning Commission for review at a workshop prior to being heard as a New Agenda item. At the workshop meeting, the Planning Commission would review the plat and assess its conformity to Section 401. He listed the items in Section 401 that seemed pertinent to this development, including that street rights-of-way and pavement shall be provided in accordance with city specifications, and that the City Engineer may, with the approval of City Council, impose additional requirements regarding design and construction of streets, curbs, gutters, multi-use paths and sidewalks.

Hooks stated that staff typically did not make a recommendation but had reviewed the plat and was of the opinion it met the zoning ordinance and development standards. Staff had no conditions if approved.

Jason Walls of Highland Land Planning was the applicant, and Chad Floyd of Chadwick Homes was also present. Walls remarked that they had been discussing this plat with staff for the past 11 months, and he felt they had addressed the concerns of staff and the public and thought this was a good plat.

Ritenour asked if any of the Commissioners had questions. Gant said he had visited the property and read comments from the neighbors. He was concerned about drainage issues and erosion and assumed there were plans to address that.

He noted that the lot sizes were similar to the adjacent properties and the minimum home size was 1,500 square feet, but the homes in adjacent neighborhoods were 2,000 square feet or larger. Gant wondered how large the Bradford Estates homes would be, and if they would be similar in quality to the neighbors.

Gant asked if double-fronted lots were prohibited? Hooks looked at the lots he was referencing and said they would only be double-fronted if the road touched the property line. In this case, there would be a buffer between the road and the lots.

Was there a restriction on tree removal on each lot? Gant asked. Hooks said there was no restriction, but every lot had to have two trees with a minimum of two caliper inches. They could remove all trees but had to put two back.

Gant then asked for more feedback from the Police and Fire departments regarding response times.

Fire Chief Clint Murphy explained that a northeast bypass had been planned for the past 40 years, and the Fire Department had planned on that to provide a connection to the back side of Kedron Hills. However, that was not going to be built. Murphy said Public Safety's concern was that a secondary engine from Peachtree Parkway had to go up to Kedron Hills, then back down to Astoria. Now they were talking about adding 30 homes to the north portion of this development. It would be adding to what was already a long response time. Responders needed to be on the scene in nine minutes, and the drive time right now to Astoria Lane was seven minutes, 30 seconds. They had a minute and a half turnout time, which put the response right at nine minutes. This new development would add even more time. He said the Police Department had the same problem with there being only one way in and one way out.

Gant asked about the home sizes, and Walls replied he wasn't certain about the exact size, but the price point would be \$1.5 to \$2 million and higher. They would be larger homes, he added.

Walls explained that they decided to move the road to the low side of the hill in order to capture the drainage and divert it on their property. They would also be taking drainage from the adjacent properties.

He said the entrance was moved to align with Sumner Road, and there would be green space on both sides. Walls pointed out additional green space at the end of a cul-de-sac and said it would be a passive park, maybe a bird sanctuary or dog park.

The landscaping on these lots would be about the same as in the neighboring subdivisions. Walls said they would clear paths for the roads and utilities, then remove trees from each lot as required. These homes would be on public sewer so there would be no need to clear for septic systems.

Phase 1 would be north, phase 2, south, and then the rest of the property would be developed later, Walls continued. He said they had met with the Police and Fire Departments. A connection between north and south was planned originally, but he was concerned that a cut-through situation such as in Planterra Ridge would develop. He felt like a connection could have a similar negative impact on Kedron Hills.

Allen asked if they could turn the cart path into a connecting road? He understood the desire to avoid through traffic, but the Fire Department's concern over response times should win out. Walls said they had considered that. He was aware that developments of more than 30 homes had to have at least two ways in and out, according to the International Fire Code (OFC), so the third phase would trigger that.

Was the buffer between the new homes and the existing homes 50 feet wide? Allen asked. Walls said that was correct, and it would be left as is, with some woody vegetation added for screening. He also said they would use live bottom pipes in the creeks which would minimize the land disturbance.

Kriz asked if the owner of the property for Phases 1 and 2 also owned Phase 3? The Bradshaw family owned 170 acres, Walls responded, and they were developing 88 acres now. Why were they not seeing a plat for all three at once? Kriz asked. Walls said he didn't believe that property was under contract. Right now, the seller had his house and backyard on that third phase.

Kriz asked staff if the applicant could bring all three phases to the Planning Commission so they could see how it would work together. Walls said Bradshaw would not allow it because it could restrict his use of the land. They did have a sketch of what was planned that he could share with them.

Kriz said he did not feel like this looked like the rest of Peachtree City, and he did not like how it looked. He thought there was an opportunity to make the entire parcel look like the surrounding area. He wanted to see the whole parcel as a complete plat.

Allen noted that in a few years, another developer could come in and do something completely different, and Ritenour added that what was done couldn't be undone. Gant agreed that he would like to see it all at once.

Kriz said the Commission and the community would like to know what it would all eventually look like. Walls said they could show it on a concept plat, but once it was formalized on a preliminary plat it was binding. Was Kriz saying it could be on the concept plat but not on the preliminary plat? Kriz said it was his understanding that they could approve all three phases, and Bradshaw could continue to live there. If changes were needed later, they could return to the Planning Commission. Kriz said he felt this should be approved as a whole. It was one of the last large pieces of undeveloped land in the city, and it needed to look like the rest of the area.

Allen asked if Bradshaw had indicated when he would consider opening up Phase 3? After everything was sold in phases 1 and 2, Floyd replied.

Halverson was concerned about some of the lots directly related to the 100-year flood plain, specifically lot 52, which didn't seem usable to him. How did Walls

intend to mitigate the flood plain? Walls pointed out the FEMA flood plain and also the line for a future conditions flood study that was more up to date and within the 100-year flood plain. He said the flood plain would not be disturbed, and they were meeting all conditions imposed on them in regard to the dam. As for lot 52, Walls said they might need to shorten the cul-de-sac in the engineering stage.

Halverson asked about Phase 3, and Walls said he had sketched it out for the Fire Chief and Fire Marshal. It would have 20 one-acre lots. Halverson said it was difficult to decide on anything without having the whole picture.

He suggested it would be more palatable to the neighbors if they built 4,000 square foot homes on two-acre lots. The Fire Department might be more satisfied, too.

Walls pointed out there were no two-acre lots around them. He also added that this development was just another phase of Bradshaw development. The family had originally owned all of the land in that area, including what was now Sedgewick and Smokerise. Walls noted that the plats for all those were done piecemeal—10 plats at a time. This was a continuation of what was done 20 years ago.

Halverson conceded that this was a very difficult property to develop, and Walls remarked that was why it hadn't been done already. Halverson said he didn't want to suggest Walls hadn't made a good attempt but seeing the property as a whole would help the Commission.

The road widths were exceeding City standards by a couple of feet, which would help the firefighters, Walls stated, and they were providing "eyebrow" turnarounds so they wouldn't have to go as far if they passed a house. This was different than other subdivisions in that sense, he added.

Hamner asked Walls to discuss how he had worked with neighboring property owners to alleviate some of their concerns. Walls said they had met with two people and made some changes related to their concerns and also had received numerous emails and calls.

Some of the property owners were concerned about erosion, and Hamner asked Walls to address that. Walls explained that he would submit erosion plans that met State and City requirements. They would protect the creek. Every home would have to have its own erosion control plan approved by the State.

Hamner asked how Walls had addressed other concerns from neighbors. Walls pointed out that Kedron Hills residents did not want connectivity, while the Police and Fire Departments did. He said they had shifted the road to create a 50-foot buffer and had shifted the common spaces.

Many times, Ritenour noted, when you changed one thing, it created an issue with something else. Most of the properties remaining in Peachtree City required

creativity to develop. He said the road, even with the buffer, concerned many residents. What impact would it have to move the road to abut Sedgewick?

If the road was on the high side, Walls stated, water would have to be controlled on each lot. Every lot would have individual treatment areas, and the water would be piped to the nearest pond. Walls observed that he was not sure that's what the City wanted, and Ritenour said he just wanted the residents on Ashley Way to understand the consequences of moving the road. Walls said they were trying to prevent flooding by intercepting the water with the road. He believed they would lose more trees if they tried to collect water in the backyards.

Next, Ritenour asked if it would be possible to put a bridge over Flat Creek to connect the cul-de-sac on the southern part with the end of the street on the northern part? Walls said he would prefer for the connection to be where the cart path was, if it was required.

There had been some major flooding in the Flat Creek Golf Course area, Ritenour remarked. He believed the City had purchased or considered purchasing property there because of flooding. City Engineer Dave Borkowski said they had purchased a few properties in different areas of the city. Ritenour observed that they didn't want to create a flooding situation and mentioned that one of the homes would have to be right up against the side setback. There were requirements in the ordinance for a certain amount of area to be outside the flood plain when a lot was platted, Borkowski reported.

Moving on to comments from the Commissioners, Hamner agreed that this was a difficult property. It was zoned as it originally was, and the plat aligned with the zoning, as staff had said. It would be great to see the full development platted out, but there was precedent for having different phases. Hamner admitted that not everyone was happy, but he believed it would fit in terms of precedent and ordinances.

Halverson also agreed that this was difficult. Residents had a lot of concerns, and he said he did as well. He wanted to see the entire intent. He was concerned about the division, the flood plain, and the density.

Hooks pointed out that several of the Commissioners might remember that Cresswind and Everton were developed in phases. The Planning Commission never saw the next phase until they were ready to build it. She recalled that Everton had nine phases, and Cresswind, five.

Ritenour said that was a good point, but a developer usually had a vision for the entire property. He added that Smokerise was made up of several different areas that were complementary to each other. He thought they should see all phases of Bradshaw Estates at once, even though not required, especially with the concern over Fire/EMS access, water runoff/erosion, and connectivity.

In order to give proper feedback, Kriz said he needed to see the entire concept due in part to desire to encourage alternate modes of transportation for the 80 homes in this areas. He also had concerns about safety. He appreciated the applicant's concern about water diversion.

The City Engineer had imposed a condition that the developer construct a multi-use path along Sumner Road, and that would be included when this came back for a vote, Hooks stated. Walls mentioned that Sumner Road only had a 30-foot right of way, but there was a 50-foot green space. The intent was to take the path 5,000 feet south to where it crossed Sumner and connect at Smokerise Corners. Ritenour asked about a commercial development on SR 54, and Walls said there was already a connection to that. Borkowski indicated on a Google Earth map how they intended for it to tie together.

Kriz said he would be excited to see the entire plat with more connections to the path network for those 80 homes.

Allen said he would like to see a road that could reduce response times for Fire and Police. He also expressed a dislike for building on every bit of available land. He said Cresswind did a great job of placing buffers along the rear lot lines so homes were not visible to each other. He said he would like to see fewer lots or a buffer here. Walls pointed out that Cresswind had quarter-acre lots; Bradshaw Estates would have one-acre lots, so proximity was not an issue. The density here was the same as in surrounding developments.

Gant thanked Walls for answering his questions, saying it set his mind at ease that this development would be on par or even better than what was adjacent to it. He said he had a better understanding of the work they were doing to mitigate the neighbors' concerns. This would fit in very nicely with the area, Gant remarked.

Ritenour again mused that there were no simple properties left in Peachtree City. He thanked Walls for trying to accommodate staff and the residents' concerns. He realized that building a connection might open up the neighborhood to cut-through traffic. They needed to consider those lots that were in the 100-year flood plain and make some changes. He appreciated the thought that had been put into the street widths and the eyebrows. Some of these concerns might be alleviated by seeing the third phase, he continued.

Allen mentioned that Cresswind was considering a gated drive for first responders to use. That might work here and eliminate the possibility of a through-traffic problem. Borkowski said a gate was possible.

Hooks said she wanted to state for the record that the surrounding properties were the same zoning, R-43. She went on to say that the next time the developers came back, they would be asking for approval, so they needed to know what the

Commission was hoping to see. These were the comments and concerns for the developer to consider before bringing the plat back for a vote:

- Connectivity between the northern and southern sections to improve response times for Fire, EMS, and PD; consider a gate, similar to Planterra Ridge, to deter cut through traffic.
- Show the layout for Phase 3 of the development so the commissioners could make a final determination based on the complete layout for the subdivision.
- Show all proposed cart path connections to the multi-use path system.
- Consider reducing density.
- Further clarify the plans for stormwater.
- Provide more details for the 50-foot buffer proposed adjacent to the entrance road (Road A).
- Add notes to the plans regarding trip generation.

Halverson asked if they had done a traffic study, and Walls said they had not, but could add the information. The number of daily trips added should be minimal. Ritenour asked if there was a stop light in front of the new development on SR 54, and Walls said there would be a modified R-cut. Sumner Road at SR 54 would be one more area, Ritenour remarked, where traffic might be a concern.

Kriz said he was especially interested in a possible connection to the path at the top of Lake Kedron where Flat Creek came out to the northeast. He thought that connection in Phase 3 would be significant. Walls said the topography in that area was difficult, and they might not be developing that area.

Ritenour thanked staff and the applicant for their work and also thanked the residents for their interest.

Member/Staff Topics

Hooks said the next meeting was scheduled for February 9.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Gant moved to adjourn at 8:45 p.m. Kriz seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary

Scott Ritenour, Chairman

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: Justin Strickland, City Manager

FROM: Shayla Reed, Planning Director 02/03/2026

DATE: February 9, 2026

SUBJECT: Consider a Text Amendment to the Lighting Ordinance, specifically Sec. 731.2 of the Land Development Ordinance

Recommendation:

Staff recommend consideration of the text amendment referenced below.

Discussion:

Division 5. - Standards for Lighting Design, Section 731.2, Light Fixtures, currently provides that “only incandescent, fluorescent, metal halide, mercury vapor, or color-corrected high-pressure sodium lighting may be used.”

Recent development proposals, including city-initiated projects, have identified light-emitting diode (LED) lighting as the preferred lighting type; however, the current ordinance does not permit its use. Accordingly, staff propose amending the code to allow LED lighting for commercial and industrial land development projects, at the discretion of the developer.

Regulatory Details

- Sec. 731. — Building and site lighting.
 - 731.2. Light fixtures.
 - All light fixtures should be a cutoff luminaire whose source is completely concealed with opaque housing and should not be visible from any street. This provision includes lights on mounted poles, as well as architectural display and decorative lighting visible from the corridor. Fixtures should be mounted in such a manner that the cone of light is not directed at any property line of the site. Only incandescent, fluorescent, metal halide, mercury vapor or color corrected high-pressure sodium light may be used. The same type of lighting must be utilized for all fixtures and light sources on the site.

Proposed Language

- Sec. 731. — Building and site lighting.
 - 731.2. Light fixtures.
 - ○ All exterior light fixtures should ~~be~~ utilize a cutoff luminaire whose source is completely concealed with opaque housing and should not be visible from any street. This provision includes lights on light sources mounted poles, as well as architectural display and decorative lighting visible from the corridor. Fixtures should be mounted in such a manner that the cone of light is not directed at any property line of the site. Light-emitting diode (LED) is a the preferred option. Otherwise, only ~~Only~~ incandescent, fluorescent, metal halide, mercury vapor or color corrected high-pressure sodium light may be used. An application type of similar consistent lighting fixtures must be utilized for similar use applications ~~The same type of lighting must be utilized for all fixtures and light sources~~ on the site. All exterior lighting on a site shall maintain a consistent color temperature.

Relative Ordinances

[Sec. 731. - Building and site lighting.](#)

Budget Impact:

None

Attachments:

1. Sec._731.____Building_and_site_lighting. - Redline

Sec. 731. Building and site lighting.

All exterior lighting should be architecturally compatible with the building style, material, and color selections. Architectural and shoebox style cutoff fixtures shall be used in all parking areas as opposed to cobra type light fixtures and directional floodlights. Exterior lighting of the building and site should be designed so that light is not directed off the site, and the light source is shielded from direct offsite viewing. All outdoor light fixtures should be fully shielded or be designed or provided with light angle cut-offs, so as to eliminate uplighting, spill light, and glare.

Exterior architectural, display and decorative lighting visible from the designated corridors shall be generated from a concealed light source with low-level fixtures. Any lighting fixture used to illuminate parking areas, access drives or loading areas shall be of such design, so as to minimize the amount of ambient lighting perceptible from adjacent properties. In no case shall any lighting impair the vision of motorists on the corridor.

Entrances into developments from the designated corridors may be lighted for traffic safety reasons, provided such lighting does not exceed the applicable footcandle requirements specified below. Excessive illumination of signage, buildings, or site features should be avoided. Roof lighting and down-lighting washing the building walls are strongly discouraged.

731.1. Mounting height.

Fixture mounting height should be appropriate for the project and the setting. The overall height of all lighting within parking lots should not exceed 30 feet in height from finish grade to the top of the light fixture. Lower mounting heights are encouraged where sites are located adjacent to residential areas or other sensitive land uses. Use of low, bollard-type fixtures that are three to four feet in height, are encouraged as pedestrian area lighting.

731.2. Light fixtures.

All exterior light fixtures should be-utilize a cutoff luminaire whose source is completely concealed with opaque housing and should not be visible from any street. This provision includes light sources lights on-mounted poles, as well as architectural display and decorative lighting visible from the corridor. Fixtures should be mounted in such a manner that the cone of light is not directed at any property line of the site. Light-emitting diode (LED) is the preferred option. Otherwise, only incandescent, fluorescent, metal halide, mercury vapor or color corrected high-pressure sodium light may be used. An application type of similar consistent lighting fixtures must be utilized for similar use applications ~~The same type of lighting must be utilized for all fixtures and light sources~~ on the site. All exterior lighting on a site shall maintain a consistent color temperature.

731.3. Illumination levels.

All site lighting should be designed so that the level of illumination measured in footcandles (fc) at any one point meets the standards below. The planning commission shall have the discretion to allow limited flexibility as to variations in the minimum and average levels, if the proposed levels are below the following standards. The planning commission shall not allow flexibility for proposed levels which exceed the maximum levels, unless such levels strictly conform to the recommended levels within the IESNA Lighting Handbook.

<i>At property lines including right-of-way</i>	<i>Minimum level</i>	<i>Average level</i>	<i>Maximum level</i>
At property line abutting a residential use	None	-	0.5 fc
At property line abutting a retail use	None	-	1.0 fc
At property line abutting an office use	None	-	1.5 fc

<i>Off-street parking lots</i>	<i>Minimum level</i>	<i>Average level</i>	<i>Maximum level</i>
Parking lots	0.5 fc	3.0 fc	6.0 fc
Walkways and streets	0.2 fc	1.0 fc	2.0 fc
Landscape and decorative	0.2 fc	.50 fc	3.0 fc
Pedestrian	0.2 fc	2.0 fc	5.0 fc

Lighting underneath canopies for service stations or similar uses shall be restricted to no more than two 320-watt recessed lighting fixtures (including lenses) mounted flush with the bottom of the canopy on each side of a gasoline pump or other design that meets the standards of this chapter. Lighting for canopies for service stations and other similar uses shall not exceed an average of 12 fc as measured at the ground level at the inside of the outside edge of the canopy. Lighting for ATM machines shall be recessed and mounted flush with the actual canopy above the ATM machine and shall comply with the latest requirements identified within the IESNA Lighting Handbook or established by federal regulations.

Decorative wall packs may be used only at service entrances to buildings and shall not be used to draw attention to the building or provide general building or site lighting. Wall packs on the exterior of a building shall be shielded (full cut-off type bulb or light source not visible from off-site) to direct light downward and be of low wattage (100 watts or lower).

Illumination of all monument signage shall be by an externally located steady light source, which is shielded and directed solely at the sign. The intensity of the light shall not exceed 20 fc at any one point on the sign face. Colored lamps are not permitted.

(Ord. No. 884, 5-18-2006)

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Mayor and City Council
VIA: Justin Strickland, City Manager
FROM: Shayla Reed, Planning Director 02/04/2026
DATE: February 9, 2026
SUBJECT: Consider a Text Amendment to the Parking Ordinance, specifically Sec. 909 - Off-Street Automobile Parking Requirements

Recommendation:

Staff recommend consideration of the text amendment referenced below.

Discussion:

Section 909, of the city's Zoning Ordinance, establishes the requirements for off-street automobile parking and provides standards for the location and provision of parking areas in off-street locations. Off-street automobile parking is required in all zoning districts for any permitted or conditional use.

Recent discussions by the Planning Commission have identified a need to revise the existing parking regulations to incorporate provisions for golf cart parking. Additionally, city staff has identified the need for a comprehensive review of the off-street automobile parking requirements to ensure that current standards reflect evolving transportation modes, development practices, and parking demand.

Staff seeks policy guidance from the Planning Commission and City Council to inform the drafting of proposed ordinance language and ensure that revisions align with the City's long-term planning objectives and operational needs.

Golf Cart Parking

Planning Commission Direction:

The Planning Commission has requested revisions to the zoning code to allow limited parking substitutions for required minimum parking spaces. Specifically, the Commission discussed permitting, at the developer's discretion, the substitution of up to five (5) required standard vehicle parking spaces with up to five (5) golf cart parking spaces.

Staff Analysis:

Staff recommend that any approved golf cart parking spaces provided as a substitution be located immediately adjacent to the required accessible (handicap) parking spaces.

These spaces should include appropriate signage and be constructed to meet established dimensional standards for golf cart parking slabs to ensure safety, accessibility, and consistency in site design.

Bike Parking

City Council Direction:

The City Council has directed that, in addition to required golf cart parking, the zoning code be revised to include provisions for bicycle parking through the installation of bicycle racks. Council has requested that bicycle racks be located in close proximity to designated golf cart parking areas to promote multimodal access and efficient site design.

Staff Analysis:

Staff will draft ordinance language to allow and encourage the installation of bicycle racks in conjunction with golf cart parking areas. The proposed revisions will address appropriate placement, minimum standards, and compatibility with existing parking layouts to ensure safety, accessibility, and functional integration within development sites.

Revisions to (909.3) Schedule of minimum off-street parking requirements

City Staff's Insight:

City staff has received multiple inquiries requesting consideration of reductions to minimum off-street parking requirements. Post-COVID-19 shifts toward hybrid and remote work models have significantly altered parking demand for many corporate, commercial, and institutional uses. As a result, several local business districts are experiencing reduced parking utilization, particularly at office and employment centers. In some cases, older office developments with higher vacancy rates now have substantially underutilized parking areas. Concurrently, the business sector is increasingly adopting flexible, technology-driven, and shared parking strategies that reduce the need for traditional parking ratios.

City Staff Analysis:

Staff has observed that several business types—including medical facilities, financial institutions, hotels, and manufacturing uses—have incorporated hybrid or remote operational models. These shifts have reduced on-site staffing levels and customer visitation, thereby decreasing parking demand.

By way of example, many medical facilities now offer telehealth services, centralized administrative operations, and other remote service options. These operational changes have resulted in fewer daily on-site users and, correspondingly, reduced parking needs. Under current regulations, the City requires one (1) parking space per 250 square feet of gross floor area for “medical” land uses. Based on observed trends,

staff believes a reduced standard—such as one (1) parking space per 300 square feet of gross floor area—may better reflect contemporary parking demand while also reducing excess impervious surface and promoting more efficient site design.

Staff further notes that other business sectors are increasingly offering service-specific remote or hybrid options. These trends warrant additional evaluation to determine whether tailored parking reductions or flexible standards are appropriate for specific use categories. The review of the entire parking minimums would be conducted with a recommendation to follow.

Disclaimer: Staff acknowledges that the long-term stability of virtual and hybrid operational models remains uncertain. Any proposed reductions to minimum parking requirements should therefore be carefully evaluated and may include monitoring, adjustment mechanisms, or alternative compliance options to ensure the city retains sufficient parking capacity to accommodate future changes in demand.

Full Review of Parking Requirements

City Staff's Insight:

As an effort to ensure full updates to current standards, staff will provide a review and recommendations to areas of parking space size and design, minimum off-street parking requirements, parking locations, and additional considerations.

Staff Analysis:

Additional research and details to follow.

Budget Impact:

None

Attachments:

1. Sec. 909. Off street automobile parking requirements.

Sec. 909. Off-street automobile parking requirements.

Areas suitable for parking automobiles in off-street locations shall be required in all zoning districts for any permitted or conditional use. Such off-street parking areas shall have direct access to a street or drive open to public use, and shall be provided and maintained in accordance with the following requirements. These requirements are intended to meet minimum needs; however, every property owner must determine his actual needs and provide whatever spaces may be necessary beyond these minimums to remain in full compliance with the provisions of this ordinance. Shift change peaking and growth must be considered when determining parking requirements.

Such parking shall be provided in a properly graded and improved parking facility with the parking spaces composed of asphalt, concrete, porous paving blocks compacted gravel, or other materials approved by the planning commission which are unlikely to cause substantial maintenance problems.

Changes in the use of an existing structure shall also require compliance with the minimum parking requirements applicable to the new use.

Any expansion of an existing use shall be required to provide additional of-street parking related to the expansion area only, and shall not be required to provide additional off-street parking related to the existing use.

(909.1) Parking space size.

- (a) The size of a standard parking space for one vehicle shall be a rectangular area having dimensions of not less than nine (9) feet in width by eighteen (18) feet in length ~~nine feet × 18 feet.~~
- (b) For those parking spaces that adjoin a median at the end of a parking bay or adjoin a median separating parking spaces in a row of parking, the width of the parking space shall be expanded to ten (10) feet.
- (c) Parking for the physically handicapped shall be provided pursuant to the latest edition of the American'sAmericans with Disabilities Act.
- (d) Parallel parking spaces are allowed provided they do not exceed one-fifth of the number of required spaces. Parallel parking spaces shall have a dimension of nine (9) feet in width by twenty (20) feet in length. ~~nine feet × 20 feet.~~

(909.2) Parking area design.

- (a) All parking lots shall be designed in conformance with the provisions set forth within section 1109, parking lot design and landscape requirements, of the city's land development ordinance.
- (b) Access to parking facilities shall be designed so as not to obstruct free flow of traffic.
- (c) There shall be adequate provision for ingress and egress to all parking spaces to ~~insure~~ensure ease of mobility, ample clearance, and safety of vehicles and pedestrians.
- (d) In developments where vehicles may be expected to wait, (including to, but not limited to drive-thru restaurants, banks, etc.), adequate stacking space shall be provided.
- (e) The width of all driving aisles shall be in accordance with the requirements specified below unless a wider drive aisle is approved by the planning commission to facilitate special vehicle requirements:

Parking angle	Minimum driving aisle width
<u>60 degrees, golf cart parking</u>	<u>8' minimum, 10' maximum</u>
<u>90 degrees, golf cart parking</u>	<u>10' minimum, 12' maximum</u>
60 degrees, <u>standard vehicle</u>	18' minimum, 22' maximum

90 degrees, <u>standard vehicle</u>	24' minimum, 30' maximum
2-way drive aisle without parking	24'
1-way driving aisle without parking	14'

(909.3) *Schedule of minimum off-street parking requirements.*

Use	Minimum number of required parking spaces
Residential	
Assisted living	0.5 spaces per dwelling unit
Motel, hotel and bed and breakfast	1 space per guest room, 1 space for every 2 employees
Multi-family housing	2 spaces per dwelling unit
Nursing home	1 parking space for every 5 beds, 1 space for every self-care unit, and 1 space for every 2 employees on the largest shift
Single-family, attached	2 spaces per dwelling unit
Single-family, detached	2 spaces per dwelling unit
Public, civic and institutional	
Cemetery	1 space for every employee working fulltime at the site and 5 spaces for each acre devoted to cemetery use
Church	1 space for every 3 seats in the main assembly room
Club, lodge or social center	1 space for every 200 square feet of assembly area without fixed seats and 1 space for every 10 seats in an assembly area with fixed seats.
Elementary, middle, private or high school	1 space for every employee plus 1 space for every 3 students enrolled who are of driving age
Publicly-owned building	One space for every employee working at the site, one space for every ten seats in an assembly area with fixed seats, one space for every 200 square feet of assembly area without fixed seats, one space for every 300 square feet of office area, and one space for every vehicle to be stored on the site.
Vocational school	10 spaces per classroom
Eating establishments*	
With drive-thru	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area plus any outdoor dining area
With seating, high-turnover	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area plus any outdoor dining area
With seating, low turnover	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area plus any outdoor dining area
Without seating	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area

Indoor recreation/entertainment	
Commercial recreation facility	1 space for every 200 square feet of general floor area plus 1 space for every 10 seats in an assembly area with fixed seats
Recreation	1 space for every 3 persons that the facility is designed to accommodate when fully occupied plus 1 space for every 200 SF of office space or similar activities
Indoor entertainment	1 space for every 200 SF of general floor area plus one space for every 10 seats in the main assembly area
Outdoor recreation	
Golf courses	4 spaces for each green, plus 50% of the total spaces required for associated uses
Riding stable	1 space for every employee and 1 space for every animal that can be accommodated in the stable.
Office	
-Medical	1 space for every 250-300 SF of gross floor area
Professional	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Radio or television station	1 space for every 500 SF of gross floor area
Real estate sales	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Retail sales and service	
Bank or financial institution	1 space for every 250-200 SF of gross floor area
Clothing store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Convenience store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Dance studio	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Department or discount store	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Funeral home	1 space for every 4 seats in the chapel or parlor, plus 1 space for every 300 SF of office space
Furniture store	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
General retail store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Grocery/specialty food store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Home furnishings	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Health club or spa	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Hotel, motel or inn	1 space for each room to be rented plus 75 55% of the other uses associated with the establishment
Liquor store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Nightclub or bar	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area
Nursery	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Shopping center	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Veterinary clinic/boarding hospital	1 space for every employee plus 1 space for every 500 SF of gross floor area

Automotive sales and service	
Auto rental	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Automobile service facility	3 spaces for each service bay, or for each service employee, whichever is greater
Gasoline sales	No parking spaces are required for gas pump uses. All other uses on the site must meet the requirements for retail, service and repair as shown above
Car wash	1 space for each regular employee plus one space for each 250 SF of gross floor area
Truck and/ or trailer rental	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Industrial	
Contractor's office	1 space for every employee plus 1 space for every company vehicles stored on the site
Manufacturing	1 space for every 2,000 SF of gross office, plant or storage space
Office/warehouse, no manufacturing	1 space for every 300 SF of office space or administrative area, plus 1 space for every 500 SF of indoor sales or display area, plus 1 space for every 2,500 SF of storage space
Transportation facility	1 space for every employee, 1 space for every 500 square feet of public use area, and 1 space for every company vehicle to be stored on the site
Utility services	1 space for every employee working at the site
Wholesale, publishing or open yard business	1 space for every employee, 1 space for every 2,000 square feet of floor area, and 1 space for every company vehicle to be stored on the site

*As identified in the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Manual, latest edition.

(909.3) *Combination of uses.* If there is a combination of uses on a zoning lot, such as a motel with a restaurant, parking requirements will be computed separately for each use.

(909.4) *Location of parking areas.* Required off-street parking areas should be located on-site. However, off-site parking is permitted within 400 feet of the site if the owner of the off-site area relinquishes all rights to use the area for other purposes until such time as it is no longer needed for required off-street parking.

(909.5) *Common parking areas.* Two or more uses may utilize a common parking area provided the total spaces available meet their individual parking requirements and the common area will be available for parking until such time as it is no longer needed for such purpose. In determining parking requirements for areas where common parking will be used, due consideration should be made of the hours when parking will be required by the various uses. In this way, it will be possible to count individual spaces more than once where appropriate, and, thereby, reduce the total area devoted to parking.

(909.6) *Off-street parking, general conditions.* In the event a use is proposed which is not specifically provided for in the list defining minimum spaces required, subsection (909.3), the zoning administrator

shall adopt an appropriate standard from that list so that reasonable parking requirements are imposed and the general intent of this ordinance is carried out.

- (a) All parking areas shall be drained so as to prevent damage to adjoining properties or streets.
- (b) In all zoning districts, all off-street parking spaces shall ~~be of~~ paved or other acceptable ~~all weather~~ ~~all-weather~~ surfaces. In general residential, commercial and industrial zoning districts, off-street parking spaces shall be of paved surfaces.
- (c) In industrial and commercial zoning districts, the Zoning Administrator may permit the establishment of temporary unpaved parking lots for a period not to exceed one year, provided the site plan for the parking area is properly designed, the parking area and its drives consist of acceptable all-weather surfaces, and a landscape plan is prepared and implemented to offset the ~~adverse affects~~ ~~adverse effects~~ of any necessary clearing or grading on the temporary site. The zoning administrator may revoke the permit for the temporary unpaved parking area and order the immediate discontinuance of the use if the property is not maintained properly or is operated in an unsafe manner.

(909.7) Parking Substitution. At the discretion of the property owner, required minimum vehicle parking spaces may be substituted with golf cart parking spaces. A maximum of five (5) required standard vehicle parking spaces may be substituted with up to five (5) golf cart parking spaces. Golf cart parking spaces shall be clearly designated by signage and shall be located in close proximity to the primary building entrance.

(909.8) Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking shall be provided only at a designated bicycle rack. Bicycle parking shall be located and arranged to minimize obstruction to pedestrian traffic.

(Ord. No. 862, 12-1-2005)

Editor's note(s)—Ord. No. 862, adopted December 1, 2005, changed the title of § 909 from "Off-street automobile parking" to "Off-street automobile parking requirements."

Cross reference(s)—Traffic, ch. 78.